

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 3, 8, 9, 10, 22, 26, 27, and 28 have been canceled.

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 25, 2004.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 3, 4, 7 through 10, 20 through 22, and 25 through 28 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Appropriate correction has been made.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections**

**Anticipation Rejection Based on Corbett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,850)**

Claims 1 through 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Corbett et al. (U.S. Patent 4,992,850).

Applicants assert that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed inventions to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that the inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 35 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by the Corbett et al. reference because the Corbett et al. reference does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the presently claimed inventions in as complete detail as is contained in the claims.

Turning to the Corbett et al. reference, described therein is a leadframe interconnect package that is tape automated bond (TAB) bonded to circuitry on the chip and which provides a circuit connection for subsequent connection to a printed circuit board. The encapsulated chips will replace both the lead frame and printed circuit board in a conventional SIMM module.

Applicants assert that the Corbett et al. reference fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, the elements of the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25 calling for “having at least one other vacant position having, in turn, a predetermined configuration for locating a second semiconductor device thereat on the multi-chip module system, the at least one other vacant position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position”, “a substrate . . . having a first vacant position having, in turn, a predetermined configuration for locating a third semiconductor device thereat, the first vacant position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position, and having a second vacant position having, in turn, a predetermined configuration for locating a fourth semiconductor device thereat on the multi-chip module system, the second vacant position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position”, and “a substrate . . . having a first vacant predetermined configuration position for locating a third semiconductor device thereat, the first vacant vacant predetermined configuration position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position, and having a second vacant predetermined configuration for locating a fourth semiconductor device thereat on the multi-chip module system, the second vacant predetermined configuration position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position”. In contrast to the elements of the presently claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25, Applicants assert that the Corbett et al. reference is

absent any description of a vacant position for a semiconductor device except after a defective semiconductor device has been removed therefrom. The presently claimed inventions of presently amended claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25 are not described whatsoever by the Corbett et al. reference, either expressly or inherently.

Therefore, Applicants assert that presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25 are allowable as well as the currently pending dependent claims therefrom.

In summary for the reasons set forth herein, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: January 20, 2005  
JRD/ps:lmh  
Document in ProLaw